

Radiation-induced resistance oscillations in 2D electron systems with strong Rashba coupling

Jesús Iñarra^{1,2}

¹*Escuela Politécnica Superior, Universidad Carlos III, Leganes, Madrid, Spain*
 and ²*Unidad Asociada al Instituto de Ciencia de Materiales, CSIC Cantoblanco, Madrid, 28049, Spain.*
 (Dated: April 6, 2017)

We present a theoretical study on the effect of radiation on the magnetoresistance of two-dimensional electron systems with strong Rashba spin-orbit coupling. We want to study the interplay between two well-known effects in these electron systems: the radiation-induced resistance oscillations and the typical beating pattern of systems with intense Rashba interaction. We analytically derive an exact solution for the electron wave function corresponding to a total Hamiltonian with Rashba and radiation terms. We consider a perturbation treatment for elastic scattering due to charged impurities to finally obtain the magnetoresistance of the system. Without radiation we recover a beating pattern in the amplitude of the Shubnikov de Haas oscillations: a set of nodes and antinodes in the magnetoresistance. In the presence of radiation this beating pattern is strongly modified following the profile of radiation-induced magnetoresistance oscillations. We study their dependence on intensity and frequency of radiation, including the terahertz regime. The obtained results could be of interest for magnetotransport of nonideal Dirac fermions in 3D topological insulators subjected to radiation.

PACS numbers:


I. INTRODUCTION

Radiation-induced resistance oscillations (RIRO) and zero resistance states (ZRS)^{1,2} are remarkable phenomena in condensed matter physics that reveal a novel scenario in radiation-matter coupling. Those effects rise up when a high-mobility, typically above $10^6 \text{ cm}^2/\text{Vs}$, two dimensional electron system under a moderate magnetic field (B) is illuminated with microwave (MW) or terahertz (TH) radiation. The magnetoresistance (R_{xx}) of such systems (2DES) shows oscillations with peaks and valleys at a certain radiation power. When increasing power, the R_{xx} oscillations increase in turn and at high enough intensity the valleys turn into ZRS. The radiation-induced resistance oscillations show characteristic traits such as periodicity in the inverse of B ^{1,2}, a $1/4$ cycle shift in the oscillations minima³, sensitivity to temperature^{4,5} and radiation power⁶. For the latter case, a sublinear law is obtained for the dependence of RIRO on the radiation power, $R_{xx} \propto P^\alpha$, where P is the radiation power and, interestingly, the exponent is around 0.5. This clearly indicates a squared root dependence.


A great number of experiments and theoretical models have been presented to date to try to explain such striking effects. From a theoretical standpoint, we can cite for instance the displacement model⁷ based on radiation-assisted inter Landau level scattering, the inelastic model based on the effect of radiation on the nonequilibrium electron distribution function⁸. Being these two models the most cited to date, other models are more successful explaining the basic features of RIRO, such as the one by Lei et al⁹, or the radiation-driven electron orbit model¹⁰⁻¹⁴. We have to admit that to date there is no universally accepted theoretical approach among the people devoted to this field. On the other hand, some

experimental advances have been made ruling out some of the previous existing theories. For instance a very recent experiment by T.Herrmann¹⁵ concludes that RIRO are mainly dependent on bulk effects in 2DES. Then this experiment rules out theories based on the effect of radiation on edge states¹⁶ or others based on ponderomotive forces¹⁷ excited by contact illumination, as main responsables of RIRO. Another example, the experiments by Mani et al.,¹⁸⁻²¹ on power dependence rule out the theories that claimed a linear dependence of oscillations on P ⁸. The current or future theoretical models dealing with RIRO or ZRS have to confront with the available experimental results to prove how good and accurate they are. Another approach to prove theories is to check out if they are able to predict results on novel scenarios where there are no experiments carried out yet. For instance RIRO and ZRS obtained on different semiconductor platforms other than GaAs, the most extensively platform used in this kind of experiments. The main reason for using GaAs is that this platform offers the highest mobility²² to date, ($\sim 3.0 \times 10^7 \text{ cm}^2/\text{Vs}$), among different semiconductor heterostructures.

In this article we present a theoretical study on the effect of radiation on the magnetotransport in samples with strong Rashba²³⁻²⁵ spin-orbit interaction (RSOI), such as InAs. The interest by heterostructures with InAs is increasing very fast in the last years, on the one hand for their technological impact being part of new electronic devices²⁶. On the other hand from basic research standpoint in fields such as spintronics transistors and the realisation of Majorana fermions²⁷. Usually, the electron mobility in InAs has been always below $1.0 \times 10^6 \text{ cm}^2/\text{Vs}$ and RIRO can hardly be seen. Yet, there have been published very recently experimental results demonstrating that improving MBE growth



techniques in quantum wells of InAs electron mobilities can be dramatically increased²⁸. They claimed a mobility close to $3.0 \times 10^6 \text{ cm}^2/\text{Vs}$ ²⁸. Therefore, samples of InAs, with strong RSOI, can now become reasonable candidates to observe RIRO. Then, we could study the interplay of Rashba interaction and radiation in these kind of systems. We could also predict that with samples with even higher mobilities and at high enough radiation



intensity, 2DES systems with RSOI can give rise to ZRS.

Thus, we start off based on the previous theory of the radiation-driven electron orbit¹⁰⁻¹⁴. This theory stems from the displacement model⁷ and shares with it the interplay between charged impurity scattering and radiation to be at the heart of RIRO. As a reminder, the displacement model includes, in a perturbative way, electron promotion with the corresponding photons absorption to higher Landau states and subsequent electron advances and recoils via scattering to explain R_{xx} peaks and valleys. Yet, the radiation-driven electron orbit theory does not consider any radiation-assisted electron promotion. As a further evolution of the displacement model, our theory proceeds in an alternative approach starting from the exact solution of the time-dependent Schrodinger equation for an electron under magnetic field and radiation. The obtained exact wave function represents a Landau state where the guiding center is harmonically driven back and forth by radiation at the same frequency. Interestingly, the Landau states guiding center follow a classical trajectory given by the solution of the driven classical oscillator. According to this theory, the interaction of the driven Landau states with charged impurities ends up giving rise to shorter and longer average advanced distance by the scattered electrons. These distance are reflected on irradiated R_{xx} as valleys and peaks respec-

tively. An interesting trait of this model is that it encompasses quantum and classical concepts unlike the inelastic and the displacement models that are fully quantum. At this point we can highlight a recent theoretical contribution by Beltukov²⁹ et al. that is fully classical. It should not be surprising to take into account and include totally or partially classical approaches explaining RIRO considering the very low magnetic fields where this effect rise up.

We have added to the same total Hamiltonian of the radiation-driven electron orbit theory the Rashba interaction, solving exactly the corresponding time-dependent Schrodinger equation. In other words, we develop a semi-classical model based on the exact solution of the electronic wave function in the presence of a static B with important Rashba coupling interacting with radiation and a perturbation treatment for elastic scattering from charged impurities. We consider this type of scattering as the most probable at the low temperatures normally used in experiments. Following the previous model and applying a Boltzmann transport model we are able to obtain an expression for R_{xx} with radiation and RSOI. In the simulations we obtain, first without radiation, the well-known beating pattern with the system of nodes and antinodes of the Rashba magnetoresistance^{30–39}. Then, we switched on light obtaining R_{xx} that shows a strong deformation of the previous beating pattern where the nodes and antinodes follow the peaks and valleys of RIRO. We study the dependence on power and frequency including the terahertz regime. 2DES with RSOI share similar Hamiltonian with 3D topological insulators, then we consider that the results that we present in this article could be of application in the field of 3D topological insulators under the influence of radiation.

II. THEORETICAL MODEL

We consider a 2DES in the $x - y$ plane with strong Rashba coupling subjected to a static and perpendicular B and a DC electric field parallel to the x direction. Using Landau gauge for the potential vector, $\mathbf{A} = (0, Bx, 0)$, the hamiltonian of such a system, H_0 reads: $H_0 = (H_B + H_{SO})$ where the different components of H_0 are:

$$H_B = \left[\frac{p_x^2}{2m^*} + \frac{1}{2}m^*w_c^2(x - X_0)^2 \right] \sigma_0 + \frac{1}{2}g\mu_B\sigma_zB + \left[-eE_{dc}X_0 + \frac{1}{2}m^*\frac{E_{dc}^2}{B^2} \right] \sigma_0 \quad (1)$$

$$H_{SO} = -\frac{\alpha}{\hbar} [\sigma_y p_x - \sigma_x eB(x - X_0)] \quad (2)$$

X_0 is the center of the orbit for the electron spiral motion: $X_0 = -\left(\frac{\hbar k_y}{eB} - \frac{eE_{dc}}{m^*w_c^2}\right)$, E_{dc} is the DC electric field parallel to the x direction, σ_0 stands for the unit matrix, $\vec{\sigma} = (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$ are the Pauli spin matrices, g the Zeeman factor, μ_B the Bohr magneton, α the Rashba spin-

orbit coupling parameter and w_c the cyclotron frequency. The Schrodinger equation corresponding to the Hamiltonian H_0 can be exactly solved and the resulting states are labeled by the quantum number N . For $N = 0$ there is only one level of energy given by $E_0 = (\hbar w_c - g\mu_B B)/2$. For $N \geq 1$ we obtain two branches of levels labelled by $+$ and $-$ and with energies:

$$E_{N\pm} = \hbar w_c N \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(\hbar w_c - g\mu_B B)^2 + \frac{8\alpha^2}{R^2} N} \quad (3)$$

where R is the magnetic length, $R = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{eB}}$. The corresponding wave function for the $+$ branch is,

$$\psi_{N+} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L_y}} e^{ik_y y} \begin{pmatrix} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \phi_{N-1} \\ \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \phi_N \end{pmatrix} \quad (4)$$

and for the $-$ branch,

$$\psi_{N-} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L_y}} e^{ik_y y} \begin{pmatrix} -\sin \frac{\theta}{2} \phi_{N-1} \\ \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \phi_N \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$

where θ is given by $\theta = \arctan \left[\frac{2\sqrt{2}\alpha\sqrt{N}}{g\mu_B B - \hbar w_c} \right]$ and ϕ is the normalized quantum harmonic oscillator wave function, i.e., Landau state, N being the corresponding Landau level index. According to these results the Rashba spin-orbit interaction mixes spin-down and spin-up states of adjacent Landau levels to give rise to two new energy branches of eigenstates of the Hamiltonian H_0 .

To analyze magnetotransport in 2DES with RSOI we calculate the longitudinal conductivity σ_{xx} following the Boltzmann transport theory^{40–42}, where σ_{xx} is given by:

$$\sigma_{xx} = e^2 \int_0^\infty dE \rho_i(E) [\Delta X(0)]^2 W_I \left(-\frac{df(E)}{dE} \right) \quad (6)$$

being E the energy, $\rho_i(E)$ the density of initial states and $f(E)$ the electron distribution function. $\Delta X(0)$ is the shift of the guiding center coordinate for the eigenstates involved in the scattering event,

$$\Delta X(0) = [X_2(0) - X_1(0)] \simeq 2R_c \quad (7)$$

$X_2(0)$ and $X_1(0)$ being the guiding center coordinates for final and initial states respectively and R_c the cyclotron radius. W_I is the remote charged impurity scattering rate because we consider that at very low temperatures (T) this is the most likely source of scattering for electrons in high mobility 2DES. According to the Fermi's Golden Rule W_I is given by

$$W_I = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} N_I | \langle \psi_{f\pm} | V_s | \psi_{i\pm} \rangle |^2 \delta(E_f - E_i) \quad (8)$$

where N_I is the impurity density and E_i and E_f are the energies of the initial and final states respectively. V_s

is the scattering potential for charged impurities⁴¹. The matrix element inside W_I can be expressed as⁴⁰⁻⁴²:

$$|\langle \psi_{f\pm} | V_s | \psi_{i\pm} \rangle|^2 = \sum_q |V_q|^2 |I_{if}|^2 \delta_{k'_y, k_y + q_y} \quad (9)$$

where $V_q = \frac{e^2}{\epsilon(q+q_s)}$, ϵ the dielectric constant and q_s is the Thomas-Fermi screening constant⁴¹. The integral I_{if} is given by:

$$I_{if} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} [\pm \Phi_{f-1}, \Phi_f] \begin{pmatrix} e^{iq_x x} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{iq_x x} \end{pmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \pm \Phi_{i-1} \\ \Phi_i \end{bmatrix} dx \quad (10)$$

where we have considered that at low or moderate B (used in experiments of magnetoresistance oscillations) $\left[\frac{2\sqrt{2}}{g\mu_B B - \hbar w_c} \alpha \sqrt{N} \right] \rightarrow \infty$ and then $\theta \simeq \frac{\pi}{2}$

To calculate the density of states $\rho_i(E)$ of a 2DES with perpendicular B and RSOI we proceed starting off with the expression of the energy of the states, eq. (3) that can be rewritten in a more compact way:

$$E_{N\pm} = \hbar w_c \left[N \pm \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \hbar^2 N \tilde{\alpha}^2} \right] \quad (11)$$

where $\tilde{\alpha}^2 = \alpha^2 \frac{m^*}{\hbar^4 w_c}$. To obtain the new expression for $E_{N\pm}$ we have neglected the Zeeman term considering that at the magnetic fields used in experiments and in simulations it is much smaller than the Rashba term³⁷. Expressing the density of states in terms of Dirac δ -function we can write:

$$\rho_i(E) = \frac{eB}{h} \delta(E - E_0) + \frac{eB}{h} \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} [\delta(E - E_{N+}) + \delta(E - E_{N-})] \quad (12)$$

where $E_0 = \frac{\hbar w_c}{2}$. To do the sum in the expression of ρ_i we use the Poisson sum rules,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n) = -\frac{1}{2}f(0) + \int_0^{\infty} f(x)dx + 2 \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} \cos(2\pi s x) f(x) dx \quad (13)$$

and after some lengthy algebra we get to an expression that includes the state broadening and reads^{43,44}:

$$\rho_i(E) = \frac{m^*}{\pi \hbar^2} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{\pm} \left(1 \pm \frac{\hbar \tilde{\alpha}^2}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{2E\tilde{\alpha}^2}{w_c} + \hbar^2 \tilde{\alpha}^4}} \right) \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} e^{\frac{-s\pi\Gamma}{\hbar w_c}} \cos \left[2\pi s \left(\frac{E}{\hbar w_c} + \hbar \tilde{\alpha}^2 \pm \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{2E\tilde{\alpha}^2}{w_c} + \hbar^2 \tilde{\alpha}^4} \right) \right] \right\} \quad (14)$$

Γ , being the states width. This equation is essential in the present article because it reveals the presence of two cosine terms that could interfere. On the other hand, it is also important to highlight that it is obtained from an expression for the states energy that depends at the same time on the "Landau" level index, both linearly and through a square root. With this expression of the states density we recover the previous one obtained by Ch. Amann⁴³ including the states broadening. This last condition makes the expression much more useful to be used in theories explaining experimental results on 2DES with RSOI. Considering that only electrons around the Fermi level participate in the magnetotransport and the usual electron density used in these experiments²⁸, it turns out that the E term is much bigger than the Rashba term. Therefore, we can rewrite the expression of the density of states as:

$$\rho_i(E) = \frac{m^*}{\pi \hbar^2} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} e^{\frac{-s\pi\Gamma}{\hbar w_c}} \left[\cos 2\pi s \left(\frac{E}{\hbar w_c} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{2E\tilde{\alpha}^2}{w_c}} \right) + \cos 2\pi s \left(\frac{E}{\hbar w_c} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{2E\tilde{\alpha}^2}{w_c}} \right) \right] \right\} \quad (15)$$

Finally and after some algebra we can write an expression for σ_{xx} ,

$$\sigma_{xx} = \frac{e^2 m^*}{\pi \hbar^2} (\Delta X_0)^2 W_I \left\{ 1 + \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} e^{\frac{-s\pi\Gamma}{\hbar w_c}} \frac{X_S}{\sinh X_S} \left[\cos 2\pi s \left(\frac{E_F}{\hbar w_c} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{2E_F\tilde{\alpha}^2}{w_c}} \right) + \cos 2\pi s \left(\frac{E_F}{\hbar w_c} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{2E_F\tilde{\alpha}^2}{w_c}} \right) \right] \right\} \quad (16)$$

where E_F stands for the Fermi energy and $X_S = \frac{2\pi^2 k_B T}{\hbar w_c}$, k_B being the Boltzmann constant. To obtain R_{xx} we use the relation $R_{xx} = \frac{\sigma_{xx}}{\sigma_{xx}^2 + \sigma_{xy}^2} \simeq \frac{\sigma_{xx}}{\sigma_{xy}^2}$, where $\sigma_{xy} \simeq \frac{n_i e}{B}$ and $\sigma_{xx} \ll \sigma_{xy}$, n_i being the 2D electron density. The sum of cosine terms in the expression of σ_{xx} will give rise

to an interference effect that will become apparent as a beating pattern. Thus, the physical origin of the beating pattern, that has been experimentally observed, can be trace back to the slightly different energies of the two eigenstates branches.

The Hamiltonian H_0 is the same as the one of the surface states of nonideal Dirac fermions in 3D topological insulators. The only difference is that for the latter the quadratic term is small compared to linear term that it is the dominant when it comes to topological insulators. In real samples the surface states of 3D topological insulators are no longer described by massless Dirac fermions. Experiments demonstrate important band bending and broken electron-hole symmetry with respect to the Dirac point in the band structure of real 3D topological insulators^{45,46}. Therefore the results presented above, especially the ones concerning density of states and states energy, could be of interest in the study of magnetotransport in real 3D topological insulators.

If now we switch on radiation, first of all we have to add to the Hamiltonian H_0 a radiation term H_R and then: $H_0 = (H_B + H_{SO} + H_R)$, where

$$H_R = -(x - X_0)\varepsilon_0 \cos wt - X_0\varepsilon_0 \cos wt \quad (17)$$

ε_0 being the radiation electric field and w the corresponding radiation frequency. H_0 can again be solved exactly^{10,11,47,48}, and the solution for the electronic wave function is made up, as above, of two states branches. The wave function for the + branch is,

$$\Psi_{N+} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L_y}} e^{ik_y y} \begin{pmatrix} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \Psi_{N-1}(x, t) \\ \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \Psi_N(x, t) \end{pmatrix} \quad (18)$$

and for the - branch,

$$\Psi_{N-} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L_y}} e^{ik_y y} \begin{pmatrix} -\sin \frac{\theta}{2} \Psi_{N-1}(x, t) \\ \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \Psi_N(x, t) \end{pmatrix} \quad (19)$$

where,

$$\Psi_N(x, t) = \Phi_N(x - X - x_{cl}(t), t) \times e^{[i \frac{m^*}{\hbar} \frac{dx_{cl}(t)}{dt} [x - x_{cl}(t)] + \frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^t L dt']} \quad (20)$$

as above, Φ_n is the solution for the Schrödinger equation of the unforced quantum harmonic oscillator where $x_{cl}(t)$ is the classical solution of a forced harmonic oscillator^{10,47,48},

$$\begin{aligned} x_{cl}(t) &= \frac{e\varepsilon_0}{m^* \sqrt{(w_c^2 - w^2)^2 + \gamma^4}} \cos(wt - \beta) \\ &= A \cos(wt - \beta) \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

γ is a phenomenologically introduced damping factor for the electronic interaction with acoustic phonons. β is the phase difference between the radiation-driven guiding center and the driving radiation itself. L with RSOI is now given by,

$$L = \frac{1}{2} m^* \dot{x}_{cl}^2 - \frac{1}{2} m^* w_c^2 x_{cl}^2 - \frac{\alpha}{\hbar} [\sigma_y m^* \dot{x}_{cl} - \sigma_x e B x_{cl}] \quad (22)$$

Apart from phase factors, the wave function for H_0 now is the same as the standard harmonic oscillator where




FIG. 3: Dependence on radiation power P of the calculated magnetoresistivity under light in 2DES with Rashba coupling. In panel (a) we exhibit R_{xx} as a function of B , for different radiation intensities starting from dark and for the same frequency $f = 103.08$ GHz. In panel (b) we exhibit $\Delta R_{xx} = R_{xx} - R_{xx}(\text{dark})$ versus P for B corresponding to dashed vertical lines on panel (a). One line corresponds to the B -position of a node and the other of an antinode. For both, node and antinode, we obtain a square root (sublinear) dependence showing the corresponding fits. ($T=1K$).

the center is displaced by $x_{cl}(t)$. In the presence of radiation, the electronic orbit center coordinates change and are given according to our model by $X(t) = X(0) + x_{cl}(t)$. This means that due to the radiation field all the electronic orbit centers in the sample harmonically oscillate at the radiation frequency in the x direction through x_{cl} . Applying initial conditions, at $t = 0$, $X(t) = X(0)$ and then $\beta = \pi/2$. As a result the expression for the time

dependent guiding center is now:

$$X(t) = X(0) + A \sin wt \quad (23)$$

In the presence of charged impurities scattering and radiation the average advanced distance by electrons is going to be different than in the dark, $\Delta X(0)$ (see Fig. 1a). Now the positions of the Landau states guiding centers are time-dependent according to the last expression. If the scattering event begins at a certain time t , the initial LS is given by, $X_1(t) = X_1(0) + A \sin wt$. After a time τ , that we call *flight time*, the electron "lands" in a final LS that is no longer X_2 as in the dark scenario. All LS have been displaced in the same direction, the same distance given by, $A \sin w\tau$. Thus, due to the swinging nature of irradiated LS, its former position is taken by another LS that we can call X_3 (see Fig. 1b). This final LS is written as, $X_3(t + \tau) = X_3(0) + A \sin w(t + \tau)$, and the scattering-induced advanced distance by the electron reads,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta X(t) &= X_3(t + \tau) - X_1(t) \\ &= X_3(0) + A \sin w(t + \tau) - X_1(0) - A \sin wt \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

In order to obtain the steady-state regime for the advanced distance we time-average over a period of the radiation field,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Delta X(t) \rangle &= \langle X_3(t + \tau) - X_1(t) \rangle \\ &= X_3(0) + \langle A \sin w(t + \tau) \rangle - \\ &\quad X_1(0) - \langle A \sin wt \rangle \\ &= X_3(0) - X_1(0) \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where obviously we have taken into account that $\langle A \sin w(t + \tau) \rangle = 0$ and $\langle A \sin wt \rangle = 0$. Here, the angular brackets describe time-average over a period of the time-dependent field. Next, we have to relate $\langle \Delta X(t) \rangle$ with the advanced distance in the dark $\Delta X(0)$. This is straightforward considering first, that during the time τ all LS have been displaced in phase the same distance $A \sin w\tau$, and secondly, that the initially position occupied by $X_2(t)$ is now occupied after τ by $X_3(t + \tau)$. In other words, X_3 is the only orbit always located at a distance $A \sin w\tau$ from $X_2(t)$. Thus, we necessarily conclude that the respective guiding centers of both LS $X_3(0)$ and $X_2(0)$ are separated by the distance, $A \sin w\tau$, i.e., $X_3(0) = X_2(0) - A \sin w\tau$ (see Fig. 1c). Substituting this result in the above expression we obtain,

$$\langle \Delta X(t) \rangle = \Delta X(\tau) = X_2(0) - A \sin w\tau - X_1(0)$$

$$= \Delta X(0) - A \sin w\tau \quad (26)$$

According to our model, this expression is responsible of RIRO including the maxima and minima positions. In order to obtain an expression and a physical meaning for τ , we can compare the condition fulfilled by the minima positions obtained from the theoretical expression to the one obtained in experiments¹. These minima positions represent one of the main traits describing RIRO and were first found by Mani et al¹ being given by:

$$\frac{w}{w_c} = \frac{5}{4}, \frac{9}{4}, \frac{13}{4}, \dots = \left(\frac{1}{4} + n \right) \quad (27)$$

where $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. According to theory, i.e., expression (26), the minima positions are obtained when,

$$w\tau = \frac{\pi}{2} + 2\pi n \Rightarrow w = \frac{2\pi}{\tau} \left(\frac{1}{4} + n \right) \quad (28)$$

Then, comparing both expressions we readily obtain that the flight time is,

$$\tau = \frac{2\pi}{w_c} \quad (29)$$

In other words, τ equals the cyclotron period T_c . This important result admits a semiclassical approach in the sense that during the time it takes the electron to "fly" from one LS to another due to scattering, the electrons in their orbits perform one whole loop.

Finally, the advanced distance due to scattering in the presence of radiation reads,

$$\Delta X(\tau) = \Delta X(0) - A \sin \left(2\pi \frac{w}{w_c} \right) \quad (30)$$

Applying these last results to a Boltzmann transport model, similarly as the first part of this section, we can get to an expression for the longitudinal conductivity of the magnetotransport of a high mobility 2DES with strong RSOI in the presence of radiation. In this expression three harmonic terms turn up, two cosine terms depending on the Fermi energy and α , that interfere to give rise to the beating pattern profile in the magnetoresistance. And one sine term depending on radiation parameters, frequency and power. We expect the latter to interfere on the beating pattern profile.

$$\sigma_{xx} \propto \left[\Delta X^0 - A \sin \left(2\pi \frac{w}{w_c} \right) \right]^2 \left\{ 1 + e^{\frac{-\pi\Gamma}{\hbar w_c}} \frac{X_S}{\sinh X_S} \left[\cos 2\pi \left(\frac{E_F}{\hbar w_c} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{2E_F \tilde{\alpha}^2}{w_c}} \right) + \cos 2\pi \left(\frac{E_F}{\hbar w_c} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{2E_F \tilde{\alpha}^2}{w_c}} \right) \right] \right\} \quad (31)$$

where we have considered only the term $s = 1$, the most important, in the sum. We consider that the above results can be of application and can predict the behavior of magnetotransport in 3D topological insulators subjected to radiation; once these systems reach enough mobility to make patent the rise of RIRO. This could happen at the same time that, without radiation, the R_{xx} beating patten begins to be visible in magnetotransport experiments in 3D topological insulators.

III. RESULTS

All calculated results presented in this article are based on the next list of parameteres regarding experiments in InAs quantum wells^{28,32–35,37}: Rashba parameter $\alpha = 0.6 \times 10^{-11} \text{eV} \cdot m$, electron density $n_i = 2.0 \times 10^{16} m^{-2}$, electron effective mass $m^* = 0.045 m_e$ where m_e is the electron rest mass and temperature, $T = 1K$.

In Fig.(1) we present calculated R_{xx} vs B for dark and irradiated scenarios in a high-mobility 2DES with strong RSOI. For the latter, the radiation frequency $f = 149 \text{ GHz}$. For the dark curve we obtain a very clear beating pattern profile made up of a system of nodes and antinodes. The radiation curve exhibits a similar beating pattern but this time dramatically deformed and modulated by the rise of the system of peaks and valleys of RIRO. In the new beating pattern the node B -positions are not affected by the presence of radiation but yet the different antinodes are, according to their B -position. This peculiar profile in R_{xx} shows up as result of the interference effect between the sine and cosine terms that is reflected in equation (23).

In Fig.(2) we present the dependence of calculated R_{xx} on P for 2DES with important Rashba coupling under radiation. In panel (a) we exhibit calculated R_{xx} vs B for a radiation frequency $f = 103.08 \text{ GHz}$, different radiation intensities from dark to 10 mW: 0.5, 1, 2.2, 4, 6.2 and 10 mW and $T = 1K$. We easily observe, as expected, that RIRO increase their amplitudes as P increases from dark. At the same time the deformation of antinodes gets stronger too, keeping constant the B -position of the nodes. In panel (b) we exhibit, again for $f = 103.08 \text{ GHz}$, $\Delta R_{xx} = R_{xx} - R_{xx}(\text{dark})$ versus P for B corresponding to dashed vertical lines on panel (a). One line corresponds to the B -position of a node and the other of an antinode. We want to check out if the presence of Rashba coupling affects the previously obtained sublinear power law for the dependence of RIRO on P . In this way we

obtain for both, according to the calculated fits (see Fig. (2.b)), an approximately square root dependence on P , concluding that Rashba coupling does not affect the sublinear law. We can theoretically explain these results according to our model. In the expression of σ_{xx} and then in R_{xx} , P only shows up in the numerator of the amplitude A as $\sqrt{P} \propto \varepsilon_0$, but not in the phase of the sine function. Thus, on the one hand, P does not affect the phase of RIRO that remains constant as P changes, and on the other hand $R_{xx} \propto \sqrt{P}$, giving rise to the sublinear (square root) power law for the dependence of R_{xx} on P . Finally, in the phase of cosine terms there is no radiation parameters concluding that radiation will not affect the B -positions of nodes and antinodes.

In Fig.(3) we present the dependence on radiation frequency of irradiated R_{xx} for 2DES with Rashba interaction. In panel (a) we show the low frequency case and in panel (b) the high frequency, obtaining similar results for both. Thus, the nodes B -position turns out to be immune to radiation frequency keeping the same ones as in the dark situation. The deformation of the antinodes changes with the frequency. The reason is that the deformation or modulation depends on the RIRO position and the latter does change with radiation frequency. As a result, the same initial antinode in the dark will deform differently according to f . We also observe that the strongest deformation corresponds to the RIRO's peaks irrespective of radiation frequency. The immunity of nodes with f can be readily explained as in the previous figure, according to Eq. (23). In this equation the nodes position depends only on the cosine terms where the Rashba term α shows up in the corresponding phases. In these phases f does not show up and then its variation will not affect the positions of either the nodes or the antinodes.

In Fig.(4) we present the obtained results for irradiated R_{xx} vs B for 2DES with Rashba coupling in the terahertz regime showing two frequencies: 300 GHz in panel (a) and 400 GHz in panel (b). For both panels we exhibit the dark case and two radiation curves. For the latter, one is obtained at low radiation intensity and the other at high. Apart form RIRO, due to radiation, and the beating patten, due to Rashba, we have obtained zero resistance states for $B \simeq 0.4T$ in the upper panel and for $B \simeq 0.55T$ in the lower panel. In the former case ZRS are obtained increasing P from an antinode in the dark scenario. This antinode ends up totally wiped out as ZRS rise up. Similar situation is presented in the lower panel but this time ZRS is obtained from a node. Similarly as before, the node disappears immersed in the ZRS region.




FIG. 4: Dependence on radiation frequency, f of irradiated R_{xx} vs B for 2DES with Rashba coupling. In panel (a) we exhibit the low frequency scenario and in panel (b) the high frequency, obtaining similar results for both. Nodes B -position is immune to frequency and antinodes shape depends on frequency because the former depends on RIRO's positions that, in turn, deeply depend on f . ($T=1K$).

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In summary we have presented a theoretical analysis on the effect of radiation on magnetotransport of 2DES with strong Rashba spin-orbit coupling. We have studied the interaction between the radiation-induced resistance oscillations and the typical beating pattern showing up in the magnetoresistance of 2DES with Rashba interaction. We have deduced an exact solution for the electron wave function corresponding to a total Hamiltonian with Rashba coupling and radiation terms.




FIG. 5: Terahertz irradiated R_{xx} versus B for 2DES with Rashba interaction for different temperatures with constant power excitation for $f = 300GHz$ in panel (a) and $f = 400GHz$ in panel (b). We obtain a ZRS region in each panel as indicated by arrows. In panel (a) an antinode is wiped out immersed in the ZRS region as the radiation intensity increases. The same in panel (b) but now for a node. ($T=1K$).

We have developed a perturbation treatment for elastic scattering due to charged impurities based on the Boltzmann theory to finally obtain an expression for the magnetoresistance of the system. In the presence of radiation we have obtained that the typical beating pattern of a 2DES with Rashba interaction is strongly modified following the profile of radiation-induced magnetoresistance oscillations. We have studied also the dependence on intensity and frequency of radiation, including the terahertz regime. For this regime we have also obtained ZRS beginning from the dark in the case of a node and in the case of antinode. We think that the results presented in this paper, could be of interest for magnetotransport of nonideal Dirac fermions in 3D

topological insulators considering that both systems share similar Hamiltonian. The only difference is that for 3D topological insulators the quadratic term is smaller than the linear that in this case is dominant. When 3D topological insulators reach enough electron mobility, all the effects related above, from the beating pattern to its modulation under the presence of radiation will be clearly apparent.

V. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge V. Tribaldos and J.M. Reynolds for useful discussions. This work is supported by the

MINECO (Spain) under grant MAT2014-58241-P and ITN Grant 234970 (EU). GRUPO DE MATEMATICAS APLICADAS A LA MATERIA CONDENSADA, (UC3M), Unidad Asociada al CSIC.

VI. REFERENCES

- ¹ R.G. Mani, J.H. Smet, K. von Klitzing, V. Narayanamurti, W.B. Johnson, V. Umansky, *Nature* **420** 646 (2002).
- ² M.A. Zudov, R.R. Lu, N. Pfeiffer, K.W. West, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90** 046807 (2003).
- ³ R. G. Mani, J. H. Smet, K. von Klitzing, V. Narayanamurti, W. B. Johnson, and V. Umansky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 146801 (2004).
- ⁴ R. G. Mani, C. Gerl, S.Schmult, W. Wegscheider and V. Umansky, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 125320, (2010).
- ⁵ J. Iñarrea and G. Platero, *Phys. Rev. B* **72** 193414 (2005).
- ⁶ Jesus Inarrea, R.G. Mani and W. Wegscheider, *Phys. Rev. B* **82** 205321 (2010).
- ⁷ A.C. Durst, S. Sachdev, N. Read, S.M. Girvin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91** 086803 (2003).
- ⁸ M.G. Vavilov et. al., *Phys. Rev. B*, **70**, 161306(2004).
- ⁹ X.L. Lei, S.Y. Liu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 226805 (2003).
- ¹⁰ J. Iñarrea and G. Platero, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94** 016806, (2005)
- ¹¹ Jesus Inarrea *Euro. Phys Lett.* **113** 57004, (2016)
- ¹² J.Inarrea and G.Platero, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **89**, 052109, (2006).
- ¹³ J.Inarrea and G.Platero, *Nanotechnology*, **21**, 315401, (2010).
- ¹⁴ J. Inarrea and G. Platero, *Phys. Rev. B*, **84**, 075313, (2011).
- ¹⁵ T.Herrmann, I.A.Dmitriev, D.A.Kozlov, M.Schneider, B.Jentzsch, Z.D.Kvon, P.Olbrich, V.V.Belkov, A.Bayer, C.Schuh, D.Bougeard, T.Kuczmik, M.Oltcher, D.Weiss and S.D.Ganichev *Phys. Rev. B*, **94**, 081301, (2016)
- ¹⁶ A.D. Chepelianskii and D.L. Shepelyansky, *Phys. Rev. B*, **80**, 241398(R) (2009).
- ¹⁷ S.A. Mikhailov, *Phys. Rev. B*, **83**, 155303 (2011).
- ¹⁸ R.G. Mani, A.N. Ramanayaka and W. Wegscheider *2011 Phys. Rev. B*, **84** 085308, (2011).
- ¹⁹ A.N.Ramanayaka, R.G. Mani, J. Inarrea and W. Wegscheider *Phys. Rev. B*, **85**, 205315, (2012).
- ²⁰ Tianyu Ye, Jesus Iarrea, W. Wegscheider and R.G. Mani *Phys. Rev. B*, **94**, 035305, (2016).
- ²¹ Jesus Inarrea, **100**, 242103, (2012).
- ²² G. C. Gardner, S. Fallahi, J. D.Watson, and M. J. Manfra, *Journal of Crystal Growth* **441**, 71 (2016).
- ²³ F.T. Vasko, *JETP Lett.* **30**, 541 (1979).
- ²⁴ Yu. A. Bychkov and E.I. Rashba, *JETP Lett.* **39**, 78, (1984).
- ²⁵ Yu. A. Bychkov and E.I. Rashba, **17**, *J. Phys. C*, **17**, 6039, (1984).
- ²⁶ N.-T. Yeh, P.-C. Chiu, J.-I. Chyi, F. Ren, and S. J. Pearton, *J. Mater. Chem. C* **1**, 4616 (2013).
- ²⁷ J. D. Sau, R. M. Lutchyn, S. Tewari, and S. Das Sarma, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 040502 (2010).
- ²⁸ T. Tschirky, S. Mueller, Ch. A. Lehner, S. Falt, T. Ihn, K. Ensslin, and W. Wegscheider, arXiv:1612.06782v1
- ²⁹ Y.M. Beltukov, and M.I. Dyakonov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 176801, (2016).
- ³⁰ X.F. Wang and P. Vasilopoulos, *Phys. Rev. B*, **67**, 085313, (2003).
- ³¹ X.F. Wang and P. Vasilopoulos, *Phys. Rev. B*, **72**, 085344, (2005).
- ³² Junsaku Nitta, Tatsushi Akazaki and Hideaki Takayanagi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 1335 (1997).
- ³³ B. Shojaei, P.J.J. O'Malley, J. Shabani, P. Roushan, B.D. Schultz, R.M. Lutchyn, C. Nayak, J.M. Martinis and C.J. Palmstron, *Phys. Rev. B* **93**, 075302 (2016).
- ³⁴ J. Luo, H. MuneKata, F.F. Fang and P. J. Stiles, *Phys. Rev. B* **41**, 7685 (1990).
- ³⁵ J. Luo, H. MuneKata, F.F. Fang and P. J. Stiles, *Phys. Rev. B* **38**, 10142 (1988).
- ³⁶ B. Das, D.C. Miller, S. Datta, R. Reifengerger, W.P. Hong, P.K. Bhattacharya, J. Singh and M. Jaffe, *Phys. Rev. B* **39**, 1411 (1989).
- ³⁷ J.P. Heida, B.J. van Wees, J.J. Kuipers, T.M. Klapwijk and G. Borghs, *Phys. Rev. B* **57**, 11911 (1998).
- ³⁸ A Fete, S Gariglio, C Berthod, D Li, D Stornaiuolo, M Gabay and J-M Triscone, *New Journal of Physics*, **16**, 112002 (2014)
- ³⁹ B. Rupperecht, S. Heedt, H. Hardtdegen, Th. Schapers, Ch. Heyn, M. A. Wilde and D. Grundler *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 035307 (2013).
- ⁴⁰ B.K. Ridley. *Quantum Processes in Semiconductors*, 4th ed. Oxford University Press, (1993).
- ⁴¹ T. Ando, A. Fowler and F. Stern, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **54**, (1982).
- ⁴² B.M. Askerov. *Electron trnasport phenomena in semiconductors*. World Scientific, Singapore, (1994).
- ⁴³ Ch. Amann and M. Brack, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **35**, 6009, (2002)

- ⁴⁴ SK. Firoz and Tarun Kanti Ghosh, J. Phys: Cond. Matt. **24**, 035302, (2012).
- ⁴⁵ Y. L. Chen, J. G. Analytis, J.-H. Chu, Z. K. Liu, S.-K. Mo, X. L. Qi, H. J. Zhang, D. H. Lu, X. Dai, Z. Fang, S. C. Zhang, I. R. Fisher, Z. Hussain, and Z.-X. Shen, Science **325**, 178 (2009).
- ⁴⁶ Z. Ren, A. A. Taskin, S. Sasaki, K. Segawa, and Y. Ando, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 241306(R) (2010).
- ⁴⁷ E.H. Kerner, Can. J. Phys. **36**, 371 (1958).
- ⁴⁸ K. Park, Phys. Rev. B **69** 201301(R) (2004).